

Module 1

Classroom Management: The Big Picture

Objective: In this module, you will begin to articulate your personal beliefs and ideals that will guide your classroom management practices.

September 10:

Hi Computer Journal,

Wow, I have been here three weeks already! I am actually enjoying this. My co-op is into applied academics, working with industry, and using the Internet all at the same time. It kinda scares me, but it does make the class a lot more interesting. Today we went to a farm fertilizer company in Chemistry class. We are going to be doing some work with the company - going through the consumer information pamphlets and putting the safe handling guidelines together with the product information; I never knew all those chemicals went into that stuff. The class is going to make posters for farmers to put up in their shops. This one kid is a real tech head. The co-op said that she is thinking about asking him to set up a school web site that has all this on it. She gave me the URL for this Centre for Applied Academics in British Columbia (<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/cfaa/>). She said there are lesson plans there that I can use as a model. Sounds like she is expecting me to do some of that stuff. I actually think it is a good idea.

The kids at this school are great. I was worried about classroom management, but really it is no sweat. The teacher laid out the rules the first day and since then we have been reminding them of what we expect at the beginning of each class. Things have gone fairly well. Every once in a while, I have to stop the class and give somebody a look or tell them to get busy, but other than that, everything here is KEWL! I think the most important thing is to just keep them busy and let them know who is in charge.

When my college supervisor first told me that I should keep a journal of my "reflections" I thought it was pretty flaky. Actually, writing this on my new computer is KEWL! Good ole Grandma always did give great gifts!

T.A.

September 11:

Journal:

OK, so maybe this classroom management bit isn't so simple. Grandma just might have been right. Her favourite expression when I was growing up was, "Pride goeth before a fall." Funny/strange how her sayings keep coming back to me. I think of her often; I can't believe it is only six weeks since her funeral.

Today this dad came in - T____'s dad. T____ is the tech head. Seems that T____ has been taking a lot of flack from the guys at school. Last night he tried to kill himself; he's gonna be ok ... when he gets out of the hospital. His dad still isn't sure if he is going to come back to this school. His dad said that "it" had been getting worse all fall. I have seen the guys pick on him. One day I came into the class and he had his stuff all over the floor. I gave him heck for it and told him to pick it up. He never said anything, but today his dad told everybody about it. I guess the other guys had taken his back pack and dumped it out. I really felt stupid. I am glad it isn't just my class. His dad says that he has been skipping phys ed class because some of the other guys keep coming up behind him when they are running laps and they give him a push on the back so he will "spill all over the floor".

So anyway, we had this big meeting with this kid's dad and now the principal and the director have decided that our school is going to have to come up with a formal discipline policy. My co-op told me afterwards that she was glad that at last something was going to be done. I never would have guessed that she had any problems with discipline. She told me that she works at developing a good relationship with each student, but that things were getting ugly in the school generally.

So, teaching wasn't much fun today. After the meeting, I just didn't feel like I had any energy. I hope things pick up 'cause today sucked big time. I miss my dog!

TA

The Context

In September of 1994, the Saskatchewan School trustees Association Research Centre convened a Safe Schools Symposium. Violence in schools has clearly become detrimental to the health, welfare and education of students and teachers alike; "Safe Schools" has become a major movement in North America. Each year in Saskatchewan over 40% of teachers experience an act of violence

that interferes with their ability to teach and students' abilities to learn. An additional 26% of teachers reported significant acts of violence in the past (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, 1994). Societal and family trends indicate that Classroom Management and Student Discipline concerns will continue to surface in our schools. School violence is not, however, a one-way street. Anderson (1994) reviewed a criminal case in which a Canadian teacher was convicted of assaulting a student. The magnitude of concern regarding classroom management and student discipline is reflected in the popularity of this workshop topic at teacher in-services and home-and-school association functions.

Recently the Saskatchewan Ministers of Education affirmed the Vision of Education as proposed by the High School Review Advisory Committee. According to this vision:

Secondary schools educate all students to achieve their full potential to attain personal excellence and contribute responsibly to society. All graduating students are adaptable, self-confident, self-reliant individuals of competence and integrity who are empowered to face the challenges of their future. (Saskatchewan Education Training and Employment, 1994, p. 2).

This vision emerged from a consultation process which integrated the perspectives of a wide range of stakeholders including educators, students, parents, and the business community. The general agreement is that schools exist to build students' competencies and self-esteem. However, when asked about concerns within the school system, public concern often does not directly reflect the goal of student self-esteem. For instance, in the latest annual Gallup Poll of USA public attitude toward schools, two categories - "fighting, violence, and gangs" and "lack of discipline" - shared the top rating as the biggest problem confronting schools. (Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1994, p. 42). Public concern over student discipline was greater than concern over the development of a positive self-concept.

Traditionally, the major focus regarding classroom management and student discipline involved techniques used by teachers in their attempts to control students (e.g., Canter, 1976; Jones, 1987; Kounin, 1970; Redl & Wattenberg, 1959). Ironically, equating classroom management with the external control of students is very costly to both the teacher and the student. Focussing

attention on external control diminishes the overall goal of student self-reliance, competence, and confidence. Consider the following:

- difficulty with student discipline is a major factor contributing to teachers going on extended leave (Graham, 1995),
- constantly monitoring pupils' behaviour creates stress for teachers (Capel, 1992),
- teachers with a humanistic orientation experience less stress and fewer problems with discipline than those with an autocratic orientation (Harris 1995),
- inappropriate classroom management and student discipline techniques disrupt work and cause teacher and student anxiety (Lewis, 1987),
- stress among pupils increases as they experience criticism, sarcasm, scape-goating, isolation, and unrealistic demands of teachers (Hyman & Zelikoff, 1986),
- pupils experience trauma and post traumatic stress disorder when they experience verbal attacks and corporal punishment (Hyman & Zelikoff, 1986),
- symptoms of pupil stress and post traumatic stress disorder include avoidance of school, fear of teachers and principals, decreased trust in adults, decreased enthusiasm for school, reluctance to talk about stressors, crying, depression, debilitating guilt, anxiety reactions, exaggerated need for praise, aggressive behaviour, and sleep disturbance (i.e., nightmares and fear of sleeping alone) (Hyman & Zelikoff, 1986),
- traditionally student teaching has not prepared teachers to deal with stress, particularly discipline-related stressors (Calhoun, 1986), and

Classroom management is more complex than it was even fifteen years ago. Traditionally, cultural groups in Canada have been actively encouraged to retain their cultural practices. The recent globalization of the economy has increased the diversity of cultural groups that comprise our school populations. Consequently, teachers are faced with the challenge of defining a shared set of values among a diverse population of students.

As well, students are more informed than ever before. Through access to media, technology and specifically the Internet, students often have access to as much or more information as their teachers have. Many teachers have students whose technological capacities are far stronger than their own; gone are the days when teachers had authority by virtue of greater information. Information is power (Toffler & Toffler, 1997) and students understand this.

Throughout our society, people are developing a greater sense of themselves as citizens with rights rather than powerless pawns. Workers no longer tolerate abuse and harassment from employers; women no longer tolerate unfair treatment from men and from systems. Students also no longer see themselves as required to follow without question the orders/directives of those in formal power over them.

Classroom management issues are more serious than simply students cooperating with instruction and being respectful to the teacher. Recent events across North America have made teachers aware of their responsibilities for creating an atmosphere of zero-tolerance in respect to student-student violence, physical, verbal, and emotional. We know that students murder each other in Canada. As well, each year a number of students in this country and in this province commit suicide because of school bullying. In March of 1998, the Saskatoon Star Phoenix ran a tragic story about a Saskatchewan teenager who made the decision in September of 1997 to end his life rather than face the taunts of his classmates.

Traditional unidirectional views of classroom management in which the teacher simply controls the students have given way to more ecological models (Johnson & Miller, 1993). This ecological perspective is based on the premise that teachers and students are in reciprocal relationships with each other and that "good" classroom management involves creating and sustaining healthy relationships, helping students make healthy choices for themselves while

respecting the needs of everyone in the group. There is no one right way to go about achieving the goal of creating and sustaining a healthy classroom environment. At the same time, it is important to articulate your basic beliefs and principles so you will have greater clarity in the belief system that guides you.

People function as unified wholes. Our thoughts, feelings and behaviours occur simultaneously. For the most part, we operate out of our value system. Our behaviours reflect our beliefs. Whenever we behave in a way that is incongruent with our thoughts or our feelings, we experience inner conflict that seeks to be resolved. An intern who ridicules a student in front of the class will experience discomfort if he or she thinks that it is wrong to humiliate a student. Conversely, an intern who does not see anything wrong with this will experience no discomfort. At the core of these reactions is the value system.

Three broad philosophical models (Habermas' 1984) theory, Maccoby and Martin's parenting/teaching styles model, and Jones and Schachter's (19__) equity model provide useful frameworks for evaluating our classroom management plans and actions.

Habermas: Levels of Intention

Habermas (1984) suggested that in all human relationships, there are basically three levels of intention that shape people's actions. In this model, every plan for action is filtered through the questions, "Why do this? What is my intention? Is this intention ethical?"

The first level of intention is born out of technical interests and emphasizes **control and conformity**. A basic level of control and conformity is essential in society. Any group that is without commonly accepted standards of conduct operates in a state of chaos. The goal of control and conformity becomes a problem when individuals cease to have a sense of self-direction and ownership over their decisions to act. Nazis concentration camp personnel who simply "carried out orders" is the extreme example of this.

At the level of control and conformity, teachers see their role as keeping students in line. A basic level of control and conformity is essential in the smooth running of the school. The metaphors that go along with this level of intention

are those of war (“back to the trenches”; “at the front line”), prisons (“guard duty”; “detention”), and zoos (“they’re acting like a bunch of caged lions”). At the extreme level of control and conformity, the differences between punishment and consequences are irrelevant. The question is simply, “*Was the technique successful in getting the students to comply.*”

The major problem with control and conformity is that students mistakenly learn to value conformity to an external code of conduct above self-direction. This becomes problematic when students have no sense of their own role in making decisions about how they will cooperate with others. Thus they become vulnerable for involvement in cult-like systems where the leader’s wishes replace the externally imposed standards of the parent, teacher, coach, etc.

At the next level of intention, Habermas (1984) sees practical interest as giving birth to an emphasis on the **mutual understanding** of norms and traditions. This level of intention emphasizes clarifying the subjective meanings of language. Mutual understanding is critical because teacher and student behaviours are public; the meanings of these actions need to be understandable to everyone within the classroom or school (Ewert, 1991). Aiming towards the mutual understanding of divergent views of social reality is particularly critical in a multi-cultural, pluralistic setting.

It is important to articulate what mutual understanding is NOT. Mutual understanding is not simply ensuring that students are aware of the teacher’s expectations. Many teachers believe that they have achieved mutual understanding if students are able to articulate the teachers’ viewpoints. Based on two-way communication models, mutual understanding means that the teacher understands the students’ perspectives, and that the students understand the teachers’ perspectives.

At the level of mutual understanding, teachers’ see their role as creating an environment in which everyone can be heard and receive acceptance. Unconditional positive regard is essential if students are to feel valued in the school setting. The metaphors that go along with this level of intentions are those of gardening and nurturing without pruning (“sow the seeds”; “students grow and flourish”; “discover what calls them”; “follow their bliss”). At the extreme level of mutual understanding, management or control of students’ behaviour is

considered oppressive. Rather, behaviour is viewed simply as an expression of the students' experiences and are to be understood and not judged or evaluated.

The danger in this interpretive model is that our understandings are built on distorted perceptions of reality and of self. If there is conflict or discomfort in relationships, this view focuses us on misinterpretation and misunderstanding of the social reality. In fact, the problem may be a social reality that needs changing. The ultimate danger is that the process implemented to achieve mutual understanding would simply push people to accept harmful social systems rather than taking coordinated social action to address abuses (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). This is a particularly problematic aspect of post-modern moral relativism. Moreover, Petrie (1984) warns of the pluralistic paralysis that occurs when we attempt to accommodate all interpretations of reality that are represented in a multicultural society.

At the third level of intentionality, Habermas (1984) sees emancipatory interests as giving birth to **self-reflection and self-determination**. The process of reflection provides insight into *why* the classroom or school operates as it does and how it *should* operate. In this frame, "[e]very act of teaching and every learning opportunity raise issues about educational purpose" (Ewert, 1991, p.356). This third level of intentionality subsumes the other two. Inherent in self-reflection and the question "Why does the classroom or school operate as it does and how it *should* operate?" is the technological question "How do I achieve my goals?" and "What (distorted) perceptions of the social reality contributed to my goals?" This third level of intentionality extends beyond these, however, to include taking constructive social action that is both enlightened and emancipatory.

At the level of self-determination and emancipatory intention, teachers see their role as facilitating students, often through questions, in the process of articulating a value system that will guide principled decision making. The metaphors are those of mirrors and virtues (e.g., "I invite you to reflect on ...;" "What might be the kind and assertive thing to do?" "How might you handle that if ...?")

Two major challenges face the teacher whose intent it is to operate at the level of self-reflection and self-determination. First, according to Kohlberg's (1976) moral reasoning paradigm, children can relate to the perspective of those

who reason one, but not two, levels above them. Some students have not developed perspective taking, the ability to decentre and take the other person's point of view. To nurture self-reflection and self-determination, therefore, the teacher works within the students' zone of proximal development (Vigotsky, 19). Second, the length of time that the process of nurturing self-reflection requires is not always available to teachers. Sometimes, an immediate action is necessary for safety reasons or simply to facilitate moving ahead with instruction. Despite these barriers to adopting the highest level of Habermas' model, the reality is that teachers will not always be present to control students and simply understanding each other's perspectives does not automatically facilitate respectful behaviour. The goal of education ultimately is to provide students with the experiences necessary for them to emerge as independent, competent and cooperative members of society.

Maccoby and Martin: Responsiveness/Demandingness Model

Baumrind (1991) and Maccoby and Martin (1983) identified four distinct styles of parenting based on a classification system involving two dimensions: **responsiveness** and **demandingness**. Responsiveness is defined as warm, supportive and caring interactions. Demandingness is defined as requiring developmentally appropriate levels of mature and responsible behaviour from the child.

Autocratic parents (Maccoby & Martin use the term authoritarian) are high on demandingness and low on responsiveness. These parents believe that adults are unconditionally right and consequently force conformity and compliance from their children by asserting their parental power. Autocratic parents tend to be intrusive and restrict their children's autonomy.

Indifferent parents are low on both demandingness and responsiveness. These parents orchestrate their lives for their own benefit and rarely interact with their children. They have little knowledge of their children's interests, activities, and friendships. When they do interact with their children, they also tend to assert their viewpoints on the basis of parental power.

Indulgent parents are low on demandingness and high on responsiveness. These parents believe that requiring their children to comply with external

expectations is intrusive. These children tend to be given developmentally inappropriate freedoms with few guidelines to help them make decisions.

Authoritative parents are high on both demandingness and responsiveness. These parents use engage their children in discussions about rights and responsibilities, thereby nurturing autonomy and self-direction in their children while retaining a vital role in their children's lives. These children experience warmth, support and acceptance as well as expectations for developmentally appropriate maturity and responsibility.

Figure 1 illustrates the four parenting styles that emerge as a result of combining high and low responsiveness with high and low demandingness.

Figure 1. Teaching Styles (adapted from Maccoby & Martin, 1983)

	Low Responsiveness	High Responsiveness
High Demandingness	Autocratic	Authoritative
Low Demandingness	Indifferent	Indulgent

According to Sternberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch (1994), the impact of parenting styles is most evident when children make the transition to adolescence. Weiner (1970) also examined the impact of parenting styles on adolescents. Those children whose parents adopt an authoritative style continue to exhibit good psychological health and academic productivity in adolescence. Children whose parents adopt an authoritarian style experience a number of physical symptoms including colds, headaches, and stomachaches. Moreover, these adolescents tend to be inhibited, rigid and lacking in curiosity and creativity. The children of parents who adopt an indulgent style continue to be psychologically well-adjusted but they engage increasingly in school misconduct and delinquencies. Similarly, children whose parents adopt an indifferent style exhibited undesirable adolescent outcomes. According to Sternberg and his colleagues, the most destructive parenting style is a **chaotic** style in which the parent bounces unpredictably from one style to another. This style is often associated with parental substance abuse and may in fact parallel the parent's cycles of intoxication, detoxification, remorse, and frustration. When any of

these styles are combined with parental hostility and aggression toward the child, the adolescent is prone to develop aggression and delinquency

Third year college of education students were asked to use the responsiveness-demandingness model to describe the behaviours of the teachers from their kindergarten to grade 12 years who they experienced as the best and the worst disciplinarian. These behaviours were then classified on the responsiveness and demandingness continua. Not surprisingly, "worst disciplinarians" exhibited behaviours classified as autocratic, indifferent or chaotic, with the majority being classified as autocratic. "Best disciplinarians" consistently exhibited behaviours classified as either authoritative or indulgent with the majority being classified as authoritative.

The behaviours of authoritative teachers included: (a) engaging students in genuine discussions about discipline issues which required the students to reason through issues and make personal judgments about right and wrong, (b) encouraging students to try new things and reframing mistakes as opportunities to learn, (c) creating a physically and psychologically safe learning environment by placing limits on students' behaviours and holding students responsible through consequences for their actions, (d) granting increasing autonomy as the students demonstrate responsibility, and (e) flexibility in negotiating modifications to rules and expectations based upon extenuating circumstances in a student's life.

There is an obvious link between the responsiveness-demandingness model proposed by Maccoby and Martin (1983) and Habermas's levels of intentions. Indifferent parents and teachers are essentially lacking in purpose. Authoritative adults focus on control and conformity exclusively. Indulgent adults emphasize mutual understanding to the exclusion of control and conformity and self-reflection and self-determination. Authoritative adults maintain a balance between control and conformity, mutual understanding, and self-determination.

If schools are to enforce a zero-tolerance for violence, it must begin with them. According to Jones and Schachter (199_) nonviolent or equitable relationships are characterized by fairness, negotiation, respect, trust, support, honesty, accountability, and nonthreatening behaviours. Though they wrote specifically in terms of marital relationships, their model can be adapted to apply to education at all levels.

The poem "Remember Me?" is essentially about violence in the teacher-student relationship. As you read the poem, identify all of the points of violence that are inherent in this teacher's approach to students.

REMEMBER ME?

*As I walk into my class each day,
I gather my weapons along the way.
A frown, a growl, a sarcastic remark,
They serve me well as I embark.*

*Intimidation, that's the key
To keeping a student on her knee.
The first sign of error is my cue
To jump and pounce and ridicule.*

*Assigning low marks helps advance my case
That students are less than the human race.
Give them an inch; they'll take a mile!
That's why you'll never see me smile.*

*"You're ignorant, lazy and ill-prepared.
Help yourself!" I said and glared!
"Don't wait for ME to teach you how.
Figure it out; you're a big girl now!"*

*"And when you have a personal glitch,
Don't come to me to complain and _ _ _ _ _!
I made it myself with no one's help.
And they never heard me cry and yelp!"*

*The only one here that will make it fine
Is the guy at the back who keeps the rest in line.
He's big, he's strong, and he is tough,
No kid with a brain gives him guff.*

*So, I sit and watch the low life squirm,
They'll prove me right; they will not learn.
And at the end of the year you will see,
They won't know math, BUT THEY'LL REMEMBER ME!*

HALF OF KNOWING WHAT SOMETHING IS, IS KNOWING WHAT IT IS NOT!

Alfred Adler used the metaphor of "spitting in the soup" to describe a powerful change process. Identifying and talking about the mistaken goals of a non-cooperative behaviour (e.g., power) resulted in a decrease in those problematic behaviours. Why? Adler compared this process to a tactic used in concentration camps. The guards would starve the inmates for weeks and then line them up to be given a delicious thick soup. As each inmate came forward to receive a bowl of soup, one guard would hold it out to another who would spit in it and stir the sputum into the broth. The inmate then had a choice: either eat or refuse the soup. If the inmate chose to eat the soup, he/she could not enjoy it because its contents were known. If the inmate refused the soup, he/she starved.

Exposing the goals of problematic teaching behaviours is a similar process. The teacher can continue to engage in disrespect, impatience, insults, harshness, inactivity, impersonal interaction and favouritism (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1991); however, exposing the behaviours for what they are and what they do to students means that the teacher who then chooses to engage in them must live with the knowledge of what he/she has done. The poem "REMEMBER ME?" is based on Schmuck and Schmuck's research findings.

This model emphasizes the importance of classroom and school relationships (teacher-student; student-student; teacher-colleague) as the context in which all teaching, learning occur.

One of the best approaches to thinking about the meaning of a behaviour in a relationship is to think of that same behaviour in a different relationship. For example, in a spousal relationship, it is often useful to ask the questions, "Would my friend accept me doing/saying that to him/her?" If the answer is, "No!" then that behaviour is likely harming the spousal relationships. Similarly, an intern can gain a third person perspective on his or her behaviours towards students by asking the questions, "What impact would that behaviour have on me if my principal or co-operating teacher did/said that to me?" Jones and Schachter list several warning signs of a relationship gone wrong; unfortunately, many of these behaviours are condoned and even expected in student/teacher relationships. What would be the impact on you, if your co-operating teacher or principal:

- criticized you excessively,
- engaged in name calling,
- humiliated you in front of peers,
- gave backhanded compliments (e.g., not a bad lesson plan, for you),
- had angry outbursts,
- was angry with you for not meeting expectations that had never been specified,
- withdrew from the relationship,
- used silent treatments,
- overprotected you by never letting you do things on your own,
- restricted with whom you could talk or consult,
- discounted problems between the two of you by saying that you are imagining things,
- discounted your feelings,
- made unilateral decisions involving you, or
- blamed you for all the problems in the classroom.

In the same way that these behaviours would do tremendous harm to an intern's self-respect and confidence, parallel behaviours directed from a teacher or intern to a student are equally violent. When reflecting on classroom management, be aware that if you recognize any these behaviour in yourself, or in one students' actions towards another, that the recipient will experience them as doing violence to his/her spirit.

Other Philosophical Models

There are a number of models that can guide the formulation of your broad philosophical ideals and goals for classroom management. Other models that may be helpful include the First Nations Sacred Circle, the principles and slogans from 12-step groups such as AA and Al-Anon, the key principles from your faith, or the key values from your own cultural background. The most important criterion for a model that guides the formulation of your philosophical ideals is that it be congruent with your deeply held values.

Reflection

TA, the intern whose journal entries were recorded at the beginning of this manual, seems to have gone through a significant shift in his thinking as a result of the suicide attempt, the meeting with the father of the boy, and his discussions with the cooperating teacher. TA has experienced a major paradigm shift as a result of double loop reflection.

The terms “reflection” and “reflective practitioner” are used so frequently in teacher education that we are in danger of dismissing them as self-explanatory and commonly understood. The process of standing back from our planning and teaching and thinking about what we are doing is critical in improving our classroom practices. This is essentially the practice of self-critique.

At one level, critique may be constructed as simply looking at our objectives and subsequently comparing the outcomes of the actions we took with our stated intentions. Reflection or critique at this level involves asking the questions, “What was I trying to achieve when I did that?” and “Was I successful in achieving what I set out to accomplish?” Actions that achieved our objectives can then be defined as effective while those that did not achieve our objectives are ineffective.

Stevenson (1993) argued that only evaluating the effectiveness of practice in achieving goals is a narrow view of reflection.

[R]eflective inquiry emphasizes more than inquiring into questions of means and the technical skills There is a concern for examining the ends (what ought to be?) as well as the means (how can we do it?) of educational practice. In other words, both

intentions and actions are viewed as important subjects of inquiry, with attention paid to the congruency between the two. (p.100)

A higher level of critique involves rethinking our intentions. This is difficult because our intentions and our objectives are born out of our value system. Standing back from our actions is difficult; standing back from our implicit value system is a courageous act of honesty and humility. It requires asking the questions, "What assumptions am I making about myself, others, and the world? Are these assumptions justifiable? If I achieved my objectives, would I violate the rights of others? of myself? of 'mother earth'?" Answering these questions is nearly impossible without some external source of guidance. This guidance may come as formal feedback from supervisors, as divergent points of view from informal discussions with peers, and insights gained through reading, watching television, and observing others. How many of us have stopped in the middle of an action because we caught a glimpse of ourselves doing the one thing that our parents had done and that we had vowed to ourselves that we would not do. However, all of the clinical supervision, peer debate and individual readings do not qualify as reflection without the companion time for meditating and personal inventory taking that results in commitment to change. Reflecting on the technical efficacy of our practice in achieving our goals is analogous to what Argyris and Schon (1974) refer to as single loop learning. Higher order reflection, that is critiquing assumptions and intentions, requires a clear understanding of the technical aspects but moves beyond that to the level of double loop learning.

Activity

Think back to your own time in school.

- Who was your favourite teacher from those years?
- What did you particularly like about this teacher?
- Who was your least favourite teacher?
- What did you not like about this teacher?
- How do these two teachers compare on Habermas' model? What level of intention did the actions of your favourite and least favourite teachers convey?
- What teaching style (Autocratic, Indifferent, Indulgent, Authoritative) did your favourite and least favourite teacher use?
- What elements of the relationship between the favourite teacher and the students as well as between the least favourite teacher and the students were

psychologically, physically, or sexually violent?

- What are your broad philosophies/goals in respect to classroom management?

Beginning Writing

In the first section of your final assignment you will be asked to articulate your broad philosophical ideals and goals. Your answer to the last question can be used to form the basis for this component of that assignment. During your internship, make short notes of time when you do and do not act in accordance with your ideals.

**Assignment 2.2: Optional Outline
Master Discipian**

(To be completed at the December 7, 1998 Distance Education Day)

Intern: _____ **Student #:** _____

Personal Philosophy & Goals of Classroom Management

Examples from Internship